



HAROLD F. HYNES

615 South Fourth
Atwood, Kansas 67730

Appl.. No. 09/945,467

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 9,13,and 16 have been canceled as not having sufficient substance to support a claim of exclusive proprietorship.


Rejection of the original 16 claims by the Examiner, included failure to define the invention, not identifying subject matter, not being structured and not in a one sentence form. This led me to restructure and rewrite the claims, with reference on the attached original claims to the replacement numbers. Included also are four claims appended for further clarification of the One Page Purchasing System, 1 (e), 1 (f), 9 and 13.

Further identification of these changes is contained in the attached "Version with markings to show changes made"

I respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

I apologize for submitting these claims without the benefit of professional legal expertise, but I don't have the funds to pay for this service. Any help you can provide to assist me in meeting the requirements of the Patent Office will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,


Harold F. Hynes

RECEIVED
NOV 04 2002
GROUP 3600

Appl. No.09/945,467

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS

A total of 16 were submitted in the application filed 9/04/2001.

Claims 9,13, and 16 have been canceled.

The remaining claims have been amended, with some being consolidated.

Four new claims have been appended.

A total of 14 claims are being submitted with this response.

Original claims amended using identical numbers are 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,14

Three original claims amended were given different numbers available, due to canceling of other claims.

Original No.	Different No.
11	12
12	10
15	8 & 11

Two of the claim numbers canceled were given new claims 9 and 13.

The original set of claims contained here shows references to the amended claims, and an enclosed amended set shows references to the original set. This was suggested by Mr. Joe Narcavage who I talked with about the scope of the amendments.

The extent of amendments made suggests that the changes can best be determined by comparing the original with the amended claims.